

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20554

21 SEP 1993

IN REPLY REFER TO:
7330-7/1700A3

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

RECEIVED

SEP 22 1993

Honorable Tim Valentine
House of Representatives
2229 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20515

Dear Congressman Valentine:

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

This is in response to your letter of September 1, 1993, in which you inquired on behalf of your constituent, Dr. Richard D. Scott, regarding the Notice of Proposed Rule Making (Notice) in PR Docket No. 92-235, 57 FR 54034 (1992). Dr. Scott is specifically concerned about the potential impact of our final rules on radio remote controlled airplane hobbyists.

Model airplane users have shared spectrum on a secondary basis with industrial users for over 25 years. Any analysis of this proposal should take into account that the low power industrial user and the radio control model airplane hobbyists effectively share spectrum through geographic separation. We are enclosing the Report and Order in GEN Docket 82-181, 47 FR 51875 (1982), which provided the current 50 channels for radio controlled model airplanes. Until 1982, the only airplane channels were exactly co-channel with industrial users and, to the best of our knowledge, there has never been a case of interference between these classes of users.

The Commission is seeking to work with all parties on this matter. To this end, FCC staff has met with the two industry groups representing model airplane users, the Academy of Model Aeronautics and the Sport Flyers Association, to discuss their concerns and methods of expanding capacity for private land mobile radio users without affecting radio control users.

Finally, to provide you with general background on PR Docket No. 92-235, I have enclosed a copy of that part of the Notice that describes the numerous proposals, plus a discussion paper released March 1, 1993. The comment period closed July 30, 1993, and we are currently reviewing our options. We hope to issue final rules early next year. Thank you for your interest. Your letter will be included in the formal record of this proceeding.

Sincerely,

/s/

Joseph A. Levin
Chief, Policy and Planning Branch
Private Radio Bureau

Enclosures

No. of Copies rec'd
List A B C D E

2 copies

TIM VALENTINE

SECOND DISTRICT
NORTH CAROLINA

PUBLIC WORKS AND
TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

SUBCOMMITTEES:

AVIATION

SURFACE TRANSPORTATION

WATER RESOURCES
AND ENVIRONMENT

SCIENCE, SPACE,
AND TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE

SUBCOMMITTEES:

SCIENCE

CHAIRMAN:

TECHNOLOGY, ENVIRONMENT
AND AVIATION

Congress of the United States

House of Representatives

Washington, DC 20515-3302

September 1, 1993

PRB
92-235

3607

WASHINGTON OFFICE:

ED NAGY
ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT

2229 RAYBURN HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING
WASHINGTON, DC 20515-3302
TELEPHONE: (202) 225-4531

DISTRICT OFFICES:

A.B. SWINDELL IV
DISTRICT ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT

3310 CROASDALE DRIVE
SUITE 302
DURHAM, NC 27705
(919) 383-8404

101 TRIANGLE COURT
NASHVILLE, NC 27856
(919) 459-8881

TOLL FREE:

1-800-541-3456

Ms. Lou Sizemore

Congressional Relations

Federal Communications Commission

1919 M Street, NW

Washington, D.C. 20554

Dear Ms. Sizemore:

Recently, I received the attached correspondence from Dr. Richard D. Scott, of Wilson, North Carolina, requesting my assistance in investigating recently proposed rule changes governing frequencies used by radio control modelers (PR 92-235).

As you can see from his letter, Dr. Scott is concerned that, by narrowing the band used by these radio enthusiasts, the FCC is jeopardizing the safe use of radio models. He fears that the use of such frequencies could cause an individual to lose control of a radio controlled craft.

I would be interested to learn more about PR 92-235, including status, research, and any opinions which have been provided which might ease the concerns addressed by my constituent.

Thank you for your assistance and cooperation. If you have questions or need further information, please contact Chuck Carr of my Washington staff at 225-4531.

Cordially,


Tim Valentine

TV:cc



**Brentwood
Veterinary Center**

103 N. Ward Boulevard
Wilson, N. C. 27893
(919) 243-6252

Robert T. Moore, D.V.M.
R. David Scott, D.V.M.

101700

MAR 25 1993

The Honorable I.T. Valentine
1510 Longworth House Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20515

March 22, 1993

Dear Mr. Valentine:

Enclosed is a copy of a letter I sent to Mr. Ralph Haller, Mr. Richard Shibben, Mr. Doron Fertig, and Mr. Herb Zeiler of the Federal Communications Commission. This letter is a follow-up to previous letters concerning the affect of proposed rule changes governing frequencies used by radio control modelers (PR 92-235).

You have recently received information from the Academy of Model Aeronautics (AMA) that explains in detail our concerns over these proposed changes. The FCC has taken a "don't worry" attitude about this and has labeled our response as emotional. We feel there are valid safety and economic reasons for not allowing these changes to occur.

Please review this letter and the AMA's information. Until the FCC proves that there will be no interference to our receivers and to new receivers crowded into this frequency band, I do not think it wise to allow the changes proposed by PR Docket 92-235 to occur.

Your consideration and support on this matter will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely

Richard D. Scott, DVM

enclosure

3-16242

FCC -

MAY 93 / P 4063

SEP 93 / P 4489

Federal Communications Commission
1919 M Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20554

March 22, 1993

Dear Chief Haller,

I am writing this letter as a follow-up to my previous letter concerning PR Docket 92-235 and its impact on radio control modeling. I have received information from the FCC about the proposed changes and have also talked with technical experts from the Academy of Model Aeronautics (AMA) and Sport Flyer's Association (SFA). I have tried to educate myself on this topic so that I can make a fair judgement of the proposed changes.

I would first like to point out the excellent relationship that has existed for many years between the FCC and the radio control model industry. As recently as 1991, new rules governing these same frequencies went into effect. These rules, even though they had a financial impact on many modelers, were encouraged and welcomed because we knew that reorganization would ensure safe and precise flying. We viewed the FCC as our friend, engaged in a mutually beneficial relationship. Now it appears that PR 92-235 may negate all of this and potentially make our recently updated equipment obsolete.

The FCC has taken the stand that changes proposed in PR 92-235 will not affect our equipment and that we have no reason to be concerned. I am of the opinion that we have much to be concerned about. Cal Orr, who writes a monthly column entitled "Radio Spectrum" for one of the industry's leading publications, R/C Modeler, has stated in a recent article that "Our current narrow band radios will not work in this environment and they cannot be updated." The receivers do not have the ability to reject such close frequencies. We would not be able to control our airplanes in this situation.

Another point that must be addressed is that even though our transmitters have a legal limit of 3/4 Watt, they actually only transmit 1/4 to 1/2 Watt. This means that our receivers can be affected by nearby frequencies within the legal power limits under the right conditions. I understand that the AMA is currently testing our equipment to determine just how much interference will occur. The bottom line is that even sporadic interference resulting in only occasional loss of control will render our radio control equipment unusable.

The FCC's responses to modelers' concerns to date all mention economic reasons to rearrange the 72 to 75 MHz band. I have stated my investment in this hobby in a previous letter. I have also pointed out the economic impact of all the local and national hobby shops that will be affected if people can no longer safely engage in this hobby. I am sure that the loss of the radio control industry would have economic repercussions that could be felt nationally, even though it may be viewed by some as less important than other industries.

I am aware that Robert Underwood, Vince Mankowski, and Ray Kowalski of the AMA have met with you and discussed our concerns. I have heard through the SFA that the R/C Manufacturers' Association will soon send you information stating their position on this proposal as well. All I can ask is that the FCC listen to the people who we modelers consider to be experts and act on their recommendations in the same spirit that has existed between us for decades. If there truly is no need for modelers to be concerned, please demonstrate the proof to our industry's experts. They will inform us that our concerns and our pens can be put to rest.

Sincerely,

Richard D. Scott, DVM

pc: Mr. Ralph Haller, Mr. Richard Shiben, Mr. Doron Fertig,
Mr. Herb Zeiler Mr. I.T. Valentine, Mr. Jesse Helms, Mr. Lauch
Faircloth